1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 AT SEATTLE 7 HOWARD J. MEYER, JR, et al., CASE NO. C17-1218RSM 8 Plaintiffs, MINUTE ORDER 9 v. 10 BAYERISCHE MOTOREN WERKE AG, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 The following MINUTE ORDER is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable 14 Ricardo S. Martinez, Chief United States District Judge: 15 On October 22, 2018, the parties filed a Joint Motion and Stipulation for a Continuance 16 of the Trial Date and Expert Disclosure Deadline. Dkt. #41. The parties indicate that one of the 17 plaintiffs is scheduled to undergo surgery allegedly related to the accident at the center of this 18 19 dispute. The parties also indicate that liability discovery is almost complete, with further 20 discovery as to damages anticipated. As a result, the parties request that the Court strike the 21 current trial date, continue the deadline for disclosure of expert testimony, and schedule a status 22 conference on January 22, 2019, to set new dates for trial and pretrial filings. 23 /// 24 /// 25 26 ///

At this time, the Court STRIKES the Joint Motion.¹ The Court will not vacate the trial date without setting a new trial date and does not believe that a status conference with the Court is necessary to set a new trial date.² The Court also notes that the parties appear to seek continuances of other pending deadlines that they do not clearly identify. Dkt. #41 (discussing further discovery left to be accomplished, requesting a date for disclosure of expert reports after the close of discovery, and discussing medical discovery necessary after recovery from surgery in January, 2019). Nothing in this Minute Order prevents the parties from refiling their request for a continuance of the trial date to a date the parties believe the case will be ready for trial or from requesting modifications to the Court's current scheduling order, as subsequently modified. Dkts. #25, #38, and #40.

Dated this day of October, 2018.

WILLIAM M. MCCOOL

Clerk

/s/ Paula McNabb Deputy Clerk

¹ The Court notes that the parties' Joint Motion is procedurally improper as it is undated and not properly signed as provided by the Court's Electronic Filing Procedures. *See* LCR 10(e)(4). Counsel are reminded that they are expected to be familiar with the Court's local rules.

² To the extent necessary, counsel may coordinate with the Courtroom Deputy.